

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.               | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/931,007                    | 08/17/2001  | Daniel Scherman      | 03806-0512              | 2754             |
| 7590 05/09/2005               |             | EXAMINER             |                         |                  |
| Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, |             |                      | FALK, ANNE MARIE        |                  |
| Garrett & Dunne               | er, L.L.P.  |                      |                         |                  |
| 1300 I Street, N. W.          |             |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| Washington, DC 20005-3315     |             |                      | 1632                    |                  |
|                               |             |                      | DATE MAILED: 05/09/2005 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)     |  |  |  |
|---|--|------------------|--|--|--|
| Communication Do. Annol   | 09/931,007   | SCHERMAN ET AL.  |  |  |  |
| Communication Re: Appeal  | Examiner   | Art Unit         |  |  |  |
|   | Anne-Marie Falk, Ph.D.   | 1632             |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address   |  |                  |  |  |  |
| 1. The Notice of Appeal filed on is not acceptable because:   |  |                  |  |  |  |
| (a) it was not timely filed.  |  |                  |  |  |  |
| (b) the statutory fee for filing the appeal was not submitted. See 37 CFR 41.20(b)(1).  |  |                  |  |  |  |
| (c) the appeal fee received on was not timely filed.  |  |                  |  |  |  |
| (d) the submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. The appeal fee required by 37 CFR 41.20(b)(1) is \$  |  |                  |  |  |  |
| (e) the appeal is not in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31(a)(1) in that no claim has been twice rejected.   |  |                  |  |  |  |
| (f) a Notice of Allowability, PTO-37, was mailed by the Office on   |  |                  |  |  |  |
| 2. The appeal brief filed on is NOT acceptable for the reason(s) indicated below:   |  |                  |  |  |  |
| (a) the brief and/or brief fee is untimely. See 37 CFR 41.37(a).  |  |                  |  |  |  |
| (b) the statutory fee for filing the brief has not been submitted. See 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2).  |  |                  |  |  |  |
| (c) the submitted brief fee of \$ is insufficient. The brief fee required by 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2) is \$   |  |                  |  |  |  |
| The appeal in this application will be dismissed unless corrective action is taken to timely submit the brief and requisite fee. See 37 CFR 41.37(a)(1). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). See 37 CFR 41.37(e). |  |                  |  |  |  |
| 3. ☑ The appeal in this application is DISMISSED because:   |  |                  |  |  |  |
| (a) the statutory fee for filing the brief as required under 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2) was not timely submitted and the period for obtaining an extension of time to file the brief under 37 CFR 1.136(a) has expired.                         |  |                  |  |  |  |
| (b) \(\sime\) the brief was not timely filed and the period for obtaining an extension of time to file the brief under 37 CFR 1.136(a) has expired.   |  |                  |  |  |  |
| (c) a Request for Continued Examination (R  | c) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed on   |                  |  |  |  |
| (d) ☑ other: On 4/26/05, Steven O'Connor con  | firmed that no reply was filed in t  | <u>his case.</u> |  |  |  |
| 4. Because of the dismissal of the appeal, this a   | oplication:  |                  |  |  |  |
| (a) 🛛 is abandoned because there are no allow   |  |                  |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(b) is before the examiner for final disposition<br/>on the merits remains CLOSED.</li></ul>  | is before the examiner for final disposition because it contains allowed claims. Prosecution on the merits remains CLOSED. |                  |  |  |  |
| (c) is before the examiner for consideration.   | _  |                  |  |  |  |
| Anne-Marie Falk   |  |                  |  |  |  |
|   |  | MARIE FALK, PH.D |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-461 (Rev. 9-04) PRIMARY EXAMINER